

Regular Meeting

April 24, 2006  
12:30 p.m.

A regular meeting of the Municipal Civil Service Commission convened on Monday, April 24, 2006, at 12:45 p.m. with Priscilla Tyson, Grady Pettigrew, and Eileen Paley in attendance.

\* \* \*

*RE: Review and approval of the minutes from the March 27, 2006, regular meeting.*

A motion to approve the minutes was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Review of the results of the pre-hearing conference for the following appeals:  
a) Vanessa Cooper vs. Columbus Public Schools, Appeal No. 05-BA-0006 and 06-BA-0007. Secretary II – demotion and discharge – hearing scheduled for July 17, 2006.*

PRESENT: Theresa Carter, Deputy Executive Director

Vanessa Cooper – Ms. Cooper was demoted for insubordination and then later discharged for abandonment of position. The two appeals are being combined for purposes of efficiency. The hearing will not take more than one half day and the same three witnesses will be called by both parties for the demotion portion of the hearing. The parties do not know who the witnesses would be for the abandonment charge but will provide those names by May 19, 2006.

\* \* \*

*RE: Rule Revisions.*

No rule revisions were submitted this month.

\* \* \*

*RE: Trial Board Recommendations.*

No trial board recommendations were submitted this month.

\* \* \*

*RE: Columbus Public Schools classification actions.*

*Request of the Columbus Public Schools to revise the specification for the classification of Food Service Satellite Worker (Class Code 9866).*

*Request of the Columbus Public Schools to revise the specification for the classification of Food Service Helper (Class Code 9873).*

PRESENT: Wayne Christie, Columbus Public Schools

Wayne Christie presented a request to revise the specifications for these two classifications pursuant to a request from the Ohio Association of Public School Employees (OAPSE). The revisions reflect the changes that have taken place over the last several years. OAPSE has reviewed the revisions and is in agreement with the proposed changes. Commissioner Pettigrew noted a typographical error on one of the proposed specifications and asked that it be corrected.

A motion was made to approve the request with the noted correction; it was seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Columbus Public Schools to revise the specification for the classification of Building Maintenance Materials Supervisor (Class Code 9593).*

PRESENT: Jacquelyn D. Chapman, Columbus Public Schools

Jacquelyn Chapman presented this request to revise the specification for the classification Building Maintenance Materials Supervisor. Upon a review of this specification, changes to the tasks and knowledge, skills, and abilities sections were recommended to reflect new duties for which an incumbent would be responsible.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to approve the specification review for the classification Refuse Collector with no revisions (Class Code 3924).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request to approve the review of the Refuse Collector classification with no revisions. The review of this classification is part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Refuse Collector was last reviewed in June 2001. There are currently six employees serving in this classification in the Refuse Collection Division.

As part of this review, Civil Service reviewed the specification and department representatives were solicited to provide feedback about potential changes. Based on this feedback, it was determined that the specification adequately describes the duties as they currently exist. It was therefore recommended that the review of the specification for the classification Refuse Collector be approved with no revisions.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to approve the specification review for the classification Refuse Collector and Packer Operator with no revisions (Class Code 3925).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request to approve the review of the Refuse Collector and Packer Operator classification with no revisions. The review of this classification is part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Refuse Collector and Packer Operator was last reviewed in June 2001. There are currently no employees serving in this classification. It was therefore recommended that the review of this classification be approved with no revisions.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to approve the specification review for the classification Refuse Collection Supervisor with no revisions (Class Code 3928).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request as part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Refuse Collection Supervisor was last

reviewed in November 2000. There are currently three employees serving in this classification in the Refuse Collection Division.

As part of this review, Civil Service reviewed the specification and department representatives were solicited to provide feedback about potential changes. Based on this feedback, it was determined that the specification adequately describes the duties, as they currently exist. It was therefore recommended that the review of the specification for the classification Refuse Collection Supervisor be approved with no revisions.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to approve the specification review for the classification Refuse Collection District Assistant Manager with no revisions (Class Code 3931).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request as part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Refuse Collection District Assistant Manager was last reviewed in February 2001. There are currently six employees serving in this classification in the Refuse Collection Division.

As part of this review, Civil Service reviewed a questionnaire completed by one of the incumbents and department representatives were solicited to provide feedback about potential changes. Based on this feedback, it was determined that this specification adequately describes the duties, as they currently exist. It was therefore recommended that the review of the specification for the classification Refuse Collection District Assistant Manager be approved with no revisions.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service commission staff to approve the specification review for the classification Supportive Services Advisor with no revisions (Class Code 3111).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented the Commission's request to approve the specification review for Supportive Services Advisor with no revisions as part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. This classification was last reviewed in August of 2001. There are currently ten incumbents in this classification in the Columbus Health Department.

After reviewing the specification and questionnaires completed by incumbents and reviewed by their respective supervisors, it was decided the current specification accurately describes the work as it currently exists. It was therefore recommended that the review of this specification be approved with no revisions.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to approve the specification review for the classification Income Tax Auditor with no revisions (Class Code 0660).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request that the specification for the classification Income Tax Auditor be approved with no revisions. The review of this classification was part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Income Tax Auditor was last reviewed in October 2001. There are currently forty-three employees serving in this classification in the Income Tax Division.

As part of this review, Civil Service reviewed questionnaires completed by incumbents and department representatives were solicited to provide feedback about potential changes. Based on this feedback, it was determined that this specification adequately describes the duties as they currently exist. It was therefore recommended that the review of the specification for the classification Income Tax Auditor be approved with no revisions.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to approve the specification review for the classification Income Tax Auditor Supervisor with no revisions (Class Code 0661).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request that the Income Tax Auditor Supervisor classification be approved with no revisions. This classification was reviewed as part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Income Tax Auditor Supervisor was last reviewed in October 2001. There are currently seven employees serving in this classification in the Income Tax Division.

As part of this review, Civil Service reviewed questionnaires completed by incumbents and department representatives were solicited to provide feedback about potential changes. Based on this feedback, it was determined that this specification adequately describes the duties, as they currently exist. It was therefore recommended that the review of the specification for the classification Income Tax Auditor Supervisor be approved with no revisions.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to approve the specification review for the classification Income Tax Auditor Specialist with no revisions (Class Code 0662).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request that the Income Tax Auditor Specialist classification be approved with no revisions. This classification was reviewed as part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Income Tax Auditor Specialist was last reviewed in October 2001. There is currently one employee serving in this classification in the Income Tax Division.

As part of this review, Civil Service reviewed the questionnaire completed by the incumbent and department representatives were solicited to provide feedback about potential changes. Based on this feedback, it was determined that this specification adequately describes the duties as they currently exist. It was therefore recommended that the review of the specification for the classification Income Tax Auditor Specialist be approved with no revisions.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Grants Management Coordinator (Class Code 0752).*

This item was deferred.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Debt Management Coordinator (Class Code 0755).*

This item was deferred.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Golf Assistant Professional (Class Code 3187).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request as part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Golf Assistant Professional was last reviewed in October 2001. There are currently five employees serving in this classification in the Golf Division.

It was recommended that the definition be revised to reflect the distinction that this classification is not responsible for the maintenance activities at a golf course. The proposed definition would read, "...responsible for assisting in the management of all non-maintenance golfing activities at a municipal golf course." Although, this classification is only being used in the Columbus Recreation and Parks Department, Golf Division, nothing on the specification currently indicates that Golf Assistant Professional is designated specifically for this division. Therefore, in order to specify what area of City government this classification can be utilized, it was recommended that a guidelines for class use section be added. No revisions to the examples of work, minimum qualifications, knowledge, skills, and abilities, examination type, or probationary period were recommended.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Golf Professional (Class Code 3189).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request as part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Golf Professional was last reviewed in November 2001. There are currently two employees serving in this classification in the Golf Division.

It was recommended that the definition be revised to reflect the type of course that this classification manages. The proposed definition would read, "...responsible for managing all non-maintenance golfing activities at a 9-hole municipal golf course." Because this classification is only used in the Columbus Recreation and Parks Department, Golf Division, and only one Golf Professional is allocated to a particular golf course, it was recommended that a guidelines for class use section be added to reflect these two requirements. It was also recommended that the EEO job category be changed to professional in order to provide consistency and continuity within the classification series. No revisions were proposed to the examples of work, minimum qualifications, knowledge, skills, and abilities, examination type, or probationary period.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Golf Program Manager (Class Code 3191).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request as part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Golf Program Manager was last reviewed in November 2001. There are currently five employees serving in this classification in the Golf Division.

As part of this review, Civil Service reviewed the current specification, and department representatives were solicited to provide feedback about potential changes. Based on this feedback, it was determined that some revisions were required.

It was recommended that the definition be revised to reflect that the programming activities that this classification directs are all non-maintenance and take place at an 18-hole golf course. It was also recommended that the definition be revised to reflect that Golf Program Manager works under general direction. In order to specify what area of City government this classification may be utilized and its limitations, it was recommended that a guidelines for class use section be added and that only one Golf Program Manager position be allowed to be allocated to a particular golf course. No revisions to the examples of work, minimum qualifications, knowledge, skills, and abilities, examination type, or probationary period were recommended.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Greenskeeper (Class Code 3712).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request as part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Greenskeeper was last reviewed in October 2001. There are currently fourteen employees serving in this classification in the Recreation and Parks Division, Golf Division.

No revisions to the definition were recommended. Because Greenskeeper is only being used in the Columbus Recreation and Parks Department, Golf Division, it was recommended that a guidelines for class use section be added. No revisions to the examples of work, minimum qualifications, knowledge, skills, and abilities, examination type, or probationary period were recommended.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Golf Course Superintendent (Class Code 3713).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request as part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Although Golf Course Superintendent was last reviewed in February 2002, it was being reviewed at this time because other classifications in the series have not been reviewed in five years. There are currently five employees serving in this classification in the Recreation and Parks Department, Golf Division.

No revision to the definition was recommended. Because this classification is only used by the Recreation and Parks Department, Golf Division, it was recommended that a guidelines for class use section be added. A limitation that only one Golf Course Superintendent could be allocated to a golf course would also be added to the guidelines for class use. No revisions to the examples of work, minimum qualifications, knowledge, skills, and abilities, examination type, or probationary period were recommended.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Golf Courses Maintenance Manager (Class Code 3714).*

PRESENT: Richard Cherry, Personnel Analyst II

Richard Cherry presented this request as part of the Civil Service Commission's effort to review all classifications every five years. Although Golf Courses Maintenance Manager was last reviewed in January 2002, it was being reviewed at this time because other classifications in the series have not been reviewed in five years. There is currently one employee serving in this classification in the Golf Division.

The current definition for this classification accurately reflects the main responsibility for this classification however, because Golf Courses Maintenance Manager is intended to be a single-position classification, it was recommended that the definition be revised slightly to make it clear to the reader that this is a single-position classification and the responsibilities are performed are for all municipal golf courses. It was also recommended that a guidelines for class use section be added to indicate this is a single position classification designated for the Columbus Recreation and Parks Department, Golf Division. The only other recommended revision was to the formatting of the minimum qualifications section. No revisions to the examples of work, knowledge, skills, and abilities, examination type, or probationary period were recommended.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Programmer Analyst (Class Code 0580).*

PRESENT: Barbara Crawford, Personnel Analyst II

Barbara Crawford presented this request as a follow-up from the December 2005 meeting where this classification was reviewed with no changes; at that time, the discussions regarding additional revisions had not been completed.

It was recommended that the definition be revised to read, "is responsible for writing new software programs, modifying existing programs, and for assessing, determining and analyzing operating problems and computer program requirements associated with new and existing software applications." The Department of Technology requested two minor revisions to the examples of work section that serve to update current duties and conform to approved technological language. It was recommended that the minimum qualifications be revised to read: "Possession of an associate's degree with significant coursework (30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours) in computer science, management information systems, data communications, networking, computer programming, engineering, mathematics, or closely related field and one year of technical experience writing and coding computer programs and performing associated programming duties. Substitution(s): Two years of technical experience writing and coding computer programs and performing associated programming duties may substitute for the associate's degree." One minor revision to knowledge, skills, and abilities section was added to reflect the increased use of the

internet and worldwide web. No revisions to the examination type or probationary period were recommended.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to revise the specification for the classification Senior Programmer Analyst (Class Code 0581).*

PRESENT: Barbara Crawford, Personnel Analyst II

Barbara Crawford presented this request as a follow up to its review with no changes in December of 2005; discussions regarding revisions had not been completed at that time.

The Senior Programmer Analyst classification serves as the upper level of a two-tiered programming series; a moratorium exists on the entry-level classification of Analyst Programmer I. It was recommended that the current definition be revised to change the reference to directing the preparation of computer programs to leading the preparation of computer programs. The function of directing is a responsibility of the Information Systems Supervisor over the applications area. Minor revisions to the examples of work section were recommended to update current duties and conform to approved technological language. With hiring guidelines and fiscal restraints in place within the City, departments are looking to hire individuals with experience to come into the workplace who require orientation to the systems in use rather than training and instruction on fundamentals. Therefore, it was recommended that the minimum qualifications section be revised to include possession of an associate's degree with significant coursework in computer science, management information systems, data communications, networking, computer programming, engineering, mathematics or a closely related field and three years of experience in application programming. Three years of experience in application programming may substitute for the associate's degree. One minor revision to the knowledge, skills, and abilities section was recommended to reflect the increased use of the internet and worldwide web. No revisions to the examination type or probationary period were recommended.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to abolish the specification for the classification Accountant III and amend Rule XI accordingly (Class Code 1236).*

PRESENT: Tammy Rollins, Personnel Administrative Officer

Tammy Rollins presented this request to abolish the specification for the classification Accountant III. There are currently no positions allocated to this classification, which has been vacant for the last three years. The last departments to use the classification were the Public Service and Columbus Recreation and Parks Departments.

Prior to recommending this abolishment, representatives from departments were asked if there was any need in keeping this classification or could it be abolished. While no department reported any interest in keeping the classification, the Recreation and Parks and Public Service Departments agreed the Accountant III classification could be abolished. It was, therefore, requested that the specification for the classification Accountant III be abolished as proposed.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to abolish the specification for the classification Action Center Assistant Coordinator and amend Rule XI accordingly (Class Code 0859).*

PRESENT: Tammy Rollins, Personnel Administrative Officer

Tammy Rollins presented this request to abolish the specification for the classification Action Center Assistant Coordinator. There are currently no positions allocated to this classification, which, "...is responsible for assisting in the coordination of activities within the Mayor's Action Center." The calls previously received by the Mayor's Action Center (645-CITY) are now forwarded to the new 311 Call Center, which was fully operational January 2006. Additionally, a 311 class series was created for the specific use of this new 311 Call Center. With the new center and classes in effect, it was recommended that the Action Center Assistant Coordinator classification be abolished as proposed.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to abolish the specification for the classification Action Center Coordinator and amend Rule XI accordingly (Class Code 0860).*

PRESENT: Tammy Rollins, Personnel Administrative Officer

Tammy Rollins presented this request to abolish the specification for the classification Action Center Coordinator. There are currently no positions allocated to this classification, which, "...is responsible for assisting in the coordination of activities within the Mayor's Action Center." The Mayor's Action Center has been replaced by the 311 Call Center. It was therefore recommended that the Action Center Coordinator be abolished as proposed.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to create the specification for the classification Civil Service Commission Assistant Executive Director, assign a probationary period of 365 days, designate the examination type as noncompetitive, and amend Rule XI accordingly.*

*Request of the Civil Service Commission staff to reallocate position (27-01-00087) in the Executive Assistant to the Director classification (Class Code 0069) to the proposed Civil Service Commission Assistant Executive Director classification and allow the affected position incumbent to retain his current classification status and seniority.*

PRESENT: Tammy Rollins, Personnel Administrative Officer

Tammy M. Rollins presented this request to create a Civil Service Commission Assistant Executive Director in response to recommendations made by the Hay Management Consultants (HAY) HAY is a compensation consulting firm that was contracted by the City of Columbus to identify pay plan deficiencies and recommend improvements. HAY representatives evaluated almost every classification in the City relative to the know-how, accountability, and problem solving requirements of the positions. With regards to the Executive Assistant to the Director classification, one position was noted as having a much higher level of responsibility when compared to the other positions allocated to the same class. This position is allocated to the Civil Service Commission.

Because the City now uses a different methodology for assigning pay to its classifications, Commission staff consulted with the City's Compensation Manager to determine whether or not the pay that should be assigned to this one position in Civil Service warrants a different pay assignment from what is assigned to the current

classification to which this position is allocated. Based on the information provided by the Compensation Manager, it was recommended that the Civil Service Commission Assistant Executive Director classification be approved as proposed to ensure that this position is compensated appropriately for the size and level of its responsibility.

By definition, the proposed Civil Service Commission Assistant Executive Director would be responsible for assisting the Executive Director in the direction of administrative and operational functions of the Civil Service Commission. The examples of work section was developed to be reflective of the duties typically performed by the incumbent in this class. The proposed minimum qualifications require possession of a bachelor's degree, and five years of professional human resources experience, two years of which must have involved managing human-resources-related or specialized program, function, or unit. A substitution was recommended that would allow a master's degree in business administration, public administration, or other related degree to be substituted for one year of the required non-managerial experience. The proposed knowledge, skills, and abilities were developed to support the examples of work and minimum qualifications. It was recommended that the examination type be designated as noncompetitive and that the probationary period be assigned 365 days.

A motion to approve the request was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

\* \* \*

*RE: Residency Hearing Reviews.*

No residency hearing reviews were submitted this month.

\* \* \*

*RE: Administrative/Jurisdictional Reviews.*

*Review of the appeal of Michael Mosley regarding his 3<sup>rd</sup> Step Grievance with Columbus Public Schools – Appeal No. 06-BA-0011.*

The Commissioners reviewed the appeal Mr. Mosley filed on February 24, 2006, requesting a review of the time he was placed in a Leave of Absence status due to failing to complete recertification requirements

Ohio Revised Code Section 124.34 states in its pertinent part,

In case of a reduction, suspension of more than three working days, fine in excess of three days' pay, or removal, except for the reduction or removal of a probationary employee, the appointing authority shall serve the employee with a copy of the order of reduction, fine, suspension, or removal, which order shall state the reasons for the action. The order shall be filed with the director of administrative services and state personnel board of review, or the commission, as may be appropriate.

Because the action taken by Columbus Public Schools was not a disciplinary action, but was based upon Mr. Mosley's failure to maintain a required license or certification; the Commission has no jurisdiction over Mr. Mosley's appeal and dismissed it without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Husam Abu-obeid regarding his score on the entry-level Police Officer examination – Appeal No. 06-CA-0007.*

The Commissioners reviewed the appeal Mr. Abu-obeid filed on March 6, 2006, which was based on his belief the Commission staff made an error when his Behavioral Personnel Assessment Device (BPAD) answers were graded. Commission staff has checked his exam scores for accuracy and no errors were found. A passing BPAD score is necessary to pass the police officer exam and his score of 68 was not a passing score.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission decided to deny Mr. Abu-obeid's appeal and to dismiss it without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Paul Pilkington regarding the rejection of his application for the Police Property Clerk examination – Appeal No. 06-CA-0022.*

The Commissioners reviewed the appeal Mr. Pilkington filed on April 6, 2006, relative to the rejection of his application for the Police Property Clerk exam because he did not meet the minimum qualifications of six months experience in materials handling. Mr. Pilkington filed a request for review including calculations regarding part time materials handling experience that he believed would fulfill the experience requirement; however that work also did not meet the minimum qualifications.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission decided to deny Mr. Pilkington's appeal and to dismiss it without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Rhonda Sipe regarding the reallocation of her position from Account Clerk to Fiscal Assistant I – Appeal No. 06-CA-0008.*

The Commissioners reviewed the appeal Ms. Sipe filed on March 8, 2006. The basis of her appeal was that she believed the Clerical Consolidation Project should have resulted in a reallocation of her position to Fiscal Assistant II, instead of Fiscal Assistant I. Ms. Sipe listed several duties she performs which she believed were more closely associated with the Fiscal Assistant II classification and stated that she thought the 30-minute audit was too short to accurately assess the duties associated with her position.

Ms. Sipe's job audit also included contact with her human resources officer and management. Further due to the extended nature of this project, earlier this year the Commission took the additional step of contacting her department again to review any changes that may have occurred. Ms. Sipe's appointing authority concurred with the determination that based on the duties she performs her position is best classified as a Fiscal Assistant I.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission dismissed Ms. Sipe's appeal without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Mary Tomi regarding the reallocation of her position from Account Clerk to Fiscal Assistant I – Appeal No. 06-CA-0009.*

The Commissioners reviewed the appeal Ms. Tomi filed on March 8, 2006, based on her belief that the Clerical Consolidation Project should have resulted in a reallocation of her position to Fiscal Assistant II, instead of Fiscal Assistant I. Ms. Tomi listed several duties she performs which she believes are more closely associated with the Fiscal Assistant II classification. The clerical consolidation audit consisted of several components, including a structured interview with Commission staff, a review of the description of duties she provided to Commission staff, and input gathered from her human resources officer and management. Finally, due to the extended nature of this project, earlier this year the Commission took the additional step of contacting the departments to review any changes that may have occurred. Based on all of these factors, the Commission made a determination that based on the duties she performs; her position is properly classified as a Fiscal Assistant I. Ms. Tomi's appointing authority concurred with this finding.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission dismissed Ms. Tomi's appeal without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Terrance Mason regarding the reallocation of his position from Messenger to Mail Clerk – Appeal No. 06-CA-0012.*

The Commissioners reviewed the appeal Mr. Mason filed on March 10, 2006, based on his belief that the Clerical Consolidation Project should have resulted in a reallocation of his position to the Mail Specialist classification, rather than the Mail Clerk

classification. Mr. Mason provided several responsibilities he believes are more closely associated with the Mail Specialist classification.

Mr. Mason's job audit also included contact with his human resources officer and management. Due to the extended nature of this project, earlier this year the Commission took the additional step of contacting his department to review any changes that may have occurred. Mr. Mason's appointing authority concurred with the determination that based on the duties he performs, his position is best classified as a Mail Clerk.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission dismissed Mr. Mason's appeal without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Wannetta Curenton regarding the reallocation of her position from Clerk II to Office Assistant I – Appeal No. 06-CA-0013.*

The Commissioners reviewed the appeal Ms. Curenton filed on March 13, 2006, based upon her belief that the Clerical Consolidation Project should have resulted in a reallocation of her position to the Office Assistant II classification, rather than the Office Assistant I classification, and she listed several duties she believes are more closely associated with the Office Assistant II or Office Assistant III classifications. The clerical consolidation audit consisted of several components, including a structured interview with Commission staff, a review of the description of duties she provided to Commission staff, and input gathered from her human resources officer and management. Also, due to the extended nature of this project, earlier this year the Commission took the additional step of contacting the department again to review any changes that may have occurred. Based on all of these factors, the Commission made a determination that based on the duties Ms. Curenton performs, her position is best classified as an Office Assistant I and her appointing authority concurred with this finding.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission dismissed her appeal without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Beverly Brown regarding the reallocation of her position from Clerk Specialist to Office Assistant II – Appeal No. 06-CA-0014.*

The Commissioners reviewed Ms. Brown's appeal, filed on March 1, 2006, which was based on her belief that the Clerical Consolidation Project should have reallocated her position to a classification other than Office Assistant II that would be representative of her over 30 years of experience with the City of Columbus. She further stated she believed the project's results would "assuredly have a negative impact for...minority employees."

The Commission staff conducted this project based on evaluating the duties associated with 21 classifications. The focus and purpose of each audit was to ensure that employees assigned to a classification were performing duties appropriate for their classification. The results were not based on employees' departmental assignments, pay assignments, bargaining unit, race, gender, or any other impermissible factor. The Commission has received no evidence or feedback to suggest that the results had a negative impact on a specific group of employees.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission dismissed Ms. Brown's appeal without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Linda Tennant regarding the reallocation of her position from Clerk Specialist to Office Assistant I – Appeal No. 06-CA-0015.*

The Commissioners reviewed Ms. Tennant's appeal which she filed on March 13, 2006. The basis of her appeal was that as part of the Clerical Consolidation Project, Commission staff failed to interview her or her supervisor and that since the Commission's audit, she had been assigned additional duties consistent with the Office Assistant II classification.

Ms. Tennant was initially interviewed during a large group meeting at which interviews with several employees were conducted. Input was also gathered from Ms. Tennant's human resource representative and management on more than one occasion. Based on all of the information gathered during the initial audit, and during subsequent interviews, Commission staff concluded that Ms. Tennant's position should be classified as an Office Assistant I and her appointing authority concurred with the Commission's findings.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission dismissed Ms. Tennant's appeal without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Amy Ackerson regarding the reallocation of her position from Clerk II to Office Assistant I – Appeal No. 06-CA-0017.*

The Commissioners reviewed the appeal Ms. Ackerson filed on March 16, 2006. The basis of her appeal was that she believed the Clerical Consolidation Project should not have resulted in the reallocation of her position to the Office Assistant I classification and that her "job duties have changed to more various job duties."

The clerical consolidation audit consisted of several components, including a structured interview with Commission staff, a review of the description of duties Ms. Ackerson provided to Commission staff, and input gathered from her human resources officer and management. Finally, due to the extended nature of this project, earlier this year the Commission took the additional step of contacting the department again to review any changes that may have occurred. Based on the information gathered, Ms. Ackerson's position was correctly assigned to the Office Assistant I classification and her human resources representative and appointing authority concurred with this finding.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission dismissed Ms. Ackerson's appeal without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Melissa Smith regarding the reallocation of her position from Typist Clerk to Office Assistant I – Appeal No. 06-CA-0018.*

The Commissioners reviewed the appeal Ms. Smith filed on March 16, 2006, based on her belief that the duties of her position have changed since the Clerical Consolidation Project began.

Due to the extended nature of this project, earlier this year Commission staff members contacted each of the departments to review any changes that may have occurred. Based on the information gathered, Ms. Smith's position was correctly assigned to the Office Assistant I classification; her human resources representative and appointing authority concurred with this finding.

Therefore, the Commission dismissed Ms. Smith's appeal without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Donna Vicars regarding the reallocation of her position from Data Entry Operator to Office Assistant I – Appeal No. 06-CA-0019.*

The Commissioners reviewed the appeal Ms. Vicars filed on March 16, 2006, based on her belief that the Clerical Consolidation Project should have resulted in the reallocation of her position to the Office Assistant II instead of the Office Assistant I classification.

The clerical consolidation audit consisted of several components, including a structured interview with Commission staff, a review of the description of duties Ms. Vicars provided to Commission staff, and information gathered from her human resources officer and management. Finally, due to the extended nature of this project, earlier this year the Commission took the additional step of contacting the department again to review any changes that may have occurred. Based on the information gathered, Ms. Vicars' position was correctly assigned to the Office Assistant I

classification; her human resources representative and appointing authority concurred with this finding.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission dismissed Ms. Vicars’ appeal without a hearing.

*Review of the appeal of Tara Ivers regarding the reallocation of her position from Clerk II to Office Assistant I – Appeal No. 06-CA-0020.*

The Commissioners reviewed Ms. Ivers’ appeal which she filed on March 20, 2006, based upon her belief that the Clerical Consolidation Project should not have resulted in the reallocation of her position to the Office Assistant I classification.

Ms. Ivers did not indicate the classification she believed to be more appropriate for her position, but stated her job responsibilities had “increased.” Due to the extended nature of this project, earlier this year the Commission took the additional step of contacting the departments to review any changes that may have occurred. Based on the information gathered, Ms. Ivers’ position was correctly assigned to the Office Assistant I classification; her human resource representative and appointing authority concurred with this finding.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission dismissed Ms. Ivers’ appeal without a hearing.

\* \* \*

Applicants Removed Post-Exam		
Name of Applicant	Position applied for	BAR #
Melinda Martin	Police Communications Technician	06-BR-007
David Glass	Police Officer	06-BR-008
John Peters	Police Officer	06-BR-009
Obed Velez	Police Officer	06-BR-010
Michael Moore, II	Police Officer	06-BR-011
Lendell H. Hood	Police Officer	06-BR-013
Kathleen Chaney	Police Communications Technician	06-BR-014
Bryan Mason	Police Officer	06-BR-015
Erik Kientz	Police Officer	06-BR-016
Kyle Andrews	Police Officer	06-BR-017
Tasherra Burney	Police Communications Technician	06-BR-018
Robert Moore	Refuse Collection Vehicle Operator (Manual) & (Auto)	06-BR-019
Nicholas Mason	Police Officer	06-BR-020
Shawn R. Davis	Police Officer	06-BR-021
Barry D. Harp	Police Officer	06-BR-022
Clayton Kern	Police Officer	06-BR-023

The Commissioners reviewed Melinda Martin’s, Kathleen Chaney’s, and Tasherra Burney’s files and decided their names would not be reinstated to the Police Communications Technician’s eligible list.

After reviewing Robert Moore’s file, the Commissioners decided his name would not be reinstated to the Refuse Collection Vehicle Operator (Manual) and (Auto) eligible list.

The Commissioners reviewed the files of David Glass, Obed Velez, Lendell H. Hood, Bryan Mason, Kyle Andrews, Barry D. Harp, and Clayton Kern and decided their names would be reinstated to the police officer eligible list.

After reviewing the files of John Peters, Michael Moore, II, Erik Kientz, Nicholas Mason, and Shawn R. Davis, the Commissioners decided their names would not be reinstated to the police officer eligible list.

\* \* \*

The Commissioners adjourned their regular meeting at 1:09 p.m.

\* \* \*

---

Priscilla R. Tyson, Commission President

---

May 22, 2006  
Date